

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA**

SHEIK WILLIAM SALAAM HALL EL,)	
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	1:24CV546
v.)	
)	
JASMINE HALL-EL, <i>et. al.</i> ,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

ORDER

This matter is before this court for review of the Recommendation filed on July 12, 2024, by the Magistrate Judge in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). (ECF No. 2.) On July 23, 2024, Petitioner filed a document entitled “Objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Recommendation and Motion for Recusal of Magistrate Judge.” (ECF No. 4.) To the extent that this document is intended to present objections to the Recommendation, the court has appropriately reviewed the portions of the Magistrate Judge’s report to which objection was made and has made a de novo determination which is in accord with the Magistrate Judge’s report. The court therefore adopts the Magistrate Judge’s Recommendation.

To the extent that Petitioner requests the Magistrate Judge’s removal from this matter because the Magistrate Judge once allegedly taught at a university that Petitioner also attended the request is denied because it is now moot, *Watson v. Hooks*, No. 1:22CV191, 2022 WL 2155187, at *1 (M.D.N.C. June 3, 2022) (denying as moot recusal request under similar circumstances), it violates Local Rule 7.3(a) because it has not been set forth by way of a

separate motion, LR 7.3(a) (“Each motion shall be set out in a separate document.”); *Sims v. Tobin*, No. 1:22CV371, 2022 WL 17414972, at *1 n.1 (M.D.N.C. Dec. 5, 2022) (declining to consider pro se plaintiff’s unauthorized filing), and is so vague, conclusory, and speculative that it warrants summary dismissal, *United States v. Cherry*, 330 F.3d 658, 665 (4th Cir. 2003) (“A . . . judge is not . . . required to recuse himself simply because of unsupported, irrational or highly tenuous speculation.”) (citation omitted); *Terry v. United States*, No. 1:03CR299-1, 2010 WL 11639915, at *1 (M.D.N.C. Apr. 22, 2010) (denying recusal request where “the assertions are conclusory and express no basis to support an inference that the Magistrate Judge has a personal bias or prejudice or personal knowledge about evidentiary facts in this matter”).

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Magistrate Judge’s Recommendation, (ECF No. 2), is **ADOPTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the petition, (ECF No. 1), filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 be **DISMISSED**, that judgment be entered dismissing the action, that the Clerk of Court be directed to notify Petitioner about said dismissal, and that, there being no substantial issue for appeal concerning the denial of a constitutional right affecting the conviction nor a debatable procedural ruling, a certificate of appealability not issue.

A Judgment dismissing this action will be entered contemporaneously with this Order.

This, the 19th day of August 2024.

/s/ Loretta C. Biggs

United States District Judge